

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

June 16, 1966
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Absent: None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

Invocation was delivered by MAYOR LESTER PALMER.

MAYOR PALMER recognized MR. VICTOR SUMNER who is working with the Austin's Sister City Program, and asked him to introduce the distinguished visitor. MR. SUMNER reported Austin is becoming increasingly well known in the International scene, particularly in Brazil, and listed certain events of note worthiness. He introduced MR. E. SNOWDEN CHAMBERS of the United States Information Bureau Agency, who pointed out the three basic approaches to international relationships; government to government, government to people programs, and the people to people--Rotary to Rotary, etc., in exchange programs--students, persons, exhibits, culture, etc. He asked the people to join in this program, contacting the Mayor for information, and stated his department, although there was no U.S. financing, direction or control, would be glad to furnish projects. Mayor Palmer thanked Mr. Sumner and Mr. Chambers for making the Belo Horizonte Sister City Program such a success.

Pursuant to published notice thereof the following zoning applications were publicly heard:

T. J. BROWNING & B. L. McGEE By Bill Barber	Rear of 1320 East 51st Street 1400-1406 East 51st Street Additional Area Rear of 1400 East 51st Street	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission RECOMMENDED "BB" Residence
---	--	--

Councilman Long moved that the change be granted to "BB" Residence. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "BB" Residence and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

SAM LANE By Ed Kreuek	1122-1124 East 53rd Street 5300-5310 Cameron Road	From "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area To "C-1" Commercial 6th Height & Area RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
--------------------------	---	---

Councilman Long moved that the change be granted to "C-1" Commercial 6th Height and Area. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C-1" Commercial 6th Height and Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

KIRK WILLIAMSON	5801-5827 Sheridan Avenue 1100-1104 Reinli Street	From "A" Residence 1st Height & Area To "B" Residence 2nd Height & Area RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
-----------------	--	---

Councilman Long moved that the change be granted to "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence 2nd

June 16, 1966

Height and Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

RAY SMITH, JR.	812-816 East 8th Street	From "A" Residence
	Additional Area	To "C" Commercial
	810-East 8th Street	RECOMMENDED by the
	801-809 Interregional	Planning Commission
	Highway	

Councilman LaRue moved that the change be granted to "C" Commercial. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C" Commercial and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

O. D. KENDRICKS & MILTON J. RAILEY By C. Darrell Hopkins & Associates	Rear of 2132-2200 Hancock Drive	From "GR" General Retail To "C-1" Commercial RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
--	------------------------------------	--

Councilman Long moved that the change be granted to "C-1" Commercial. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C-1" Commercial and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

O-MEARA-CHANDLER CORPORATION & STUART A. NEMIR By Tom Curtis	411-419 West 24th Street 2303-2321 San Antonio St. Additional Area 410-412 West 23rd Street 2301 San Antonio Street	From "C" Commercial & "B" Residence 2nd Height & Area To "C" Commercial 4th Height & Area RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
---	---	--

Councilman Shanks moved that the change be granted to "C" Commercial 4th Height and Area. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C" Commercial 4th

Height & Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

BILLY ZIDELL 1702-1710 West Avenue
By Robert C. Sneed

From "B" Residence 1st
Height & Area
To "B" Residence 2nd
Height & Area
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

MR. ROBERT SNEED represented the applicant, pointing out this historical site is in an area of advancement and development. He said they felt the adverse recommendation of the Planning Commission was in error and in conflict with its own findings made previously, referring to the zoning of the adjoining property in 1960, in which the zoning was changed, and restrictions were tendered limiting the number of units to 50. Mr. Sneed's client had filed restrictions also and would today tender even more restrictive covenants. Under the present zoning 23 units with 3 bedrooms could be constructed which could mean 138 people occupying the property. The property on the north accommodates 200 people. His covenants would limit the number of units to 36 for this property, and further limit the number of bedrooms to 48. The number of square feet per bedroom would be greater than that on the Stautz property to the north. It would be a reduction from 69 bedrooms permitted under the present zoning to 48. Required off street parking would be provided. The same type of architecture of the Colonel House home will be maintained, and the building will be placed near West Avenue to be as far away from the property on the west as possible, and a restrictive covenant would be tendered that no building would be placed within 50' from the west property line and that a shield be provided on the west of the property. The 50' would be used for parking. Mr. Sneed said this zoning would be an extension of the zoning on the property to the north by the use of restrictive covenant the same as those made by Mr. Stautz. The restrictive covenants make the density less than what could be done under the present ordinance. He displayed the plans showing the swimming pool to be a patio type surrounded by the apartment. The traffic would not be different from what the present zoning would generate. Mr. Joseph's property to the west had a zoning change from "A" Residence to "O" Office.

Opposition was expressed by MR. AHLGRIM who said there was a difference in the figuring of the square feet and he was opposed to the off street parking next to his back yard. MR. RAYMOND DEAR stated the need for more off street parking was evident now. Also he objected to increasing the density and stated the conditions had not changed since the study last year when the area was changed to "B" Residence 1st Height and Area. MR. BOB LANDIS ARMSTRONG represented MRS. WILL SCARBROUGH, MR. DEAR, IR. LANK FORD, T. J. KUHZ, T. M. TRIMBLE, LANDRUM HICKMAN, MR. & MRS. CHARLES BEARDSLEYS, and to some extent MR. STAUTZ, pointed out the only "A" residential area close to the University and downtown is the area just west and south of this property and this zoning would mean encroaching on the last residential property in the area. He noted the recent purchases in the area. He discussed the Stautz zoning, land area, and covenant he made. Mr. Armstrong did not believe it would be fair to allow a next door competitor to come in after Mr. Stautz built in accordance with his covenant and stated the zoning should be consistent. He discussed briefly the Town House Ordinance which would be before the Council soon, pointing out the tax benefits

would be the same as apartments, and there would be owners of property instead of transient occupants. He pointed out the committee and commission turned the application down with reservation proposed by Mr. Sneed's agreeing to reduce the units to 36. He asked that the zoning be denied.

MRS. GEORGE SHELLY said the apartment house already built has parking facilities but the students do not use them. They park all over the neighborhood. She had no objection to the zoning change if the swimming pool is in place in the middle of the complex. MRS. SAM DUNHAM spoke in protest. MR. SAM DUNHAM stated they owned quite a bit of property in the neighborhood, and he did not believe Mr. Zidell wanted to cut the density of the property; that if he could build the three bedroom apartments, renting them to two people per bedroom, he would but it would not be economically feasible. Mr. Dunham was interested in building townhouses.

COUNCILMAN SHANKS figured, assuming there were 61,000 square feet in the Stautz property and 35,000 square feet in the property under consideration based on the deviation made and given Mr. Stautz of 50 apartments at 1220 square feet; and reducing the request on 35,000 square feet, if the property were treated equally as one against the other, there would be 29 apartments. In order to be fair to both, he said he would be willing to go for a stipulated number of apartments with a stipulated number of bedrooms. Mr. Sneed said there were no limits on Mr. Stautz's bedrooms. MRS. WILL SCARBROUGH was very much opposed to any change of zoning. MR. DUNHAM discussed townhouses. MR. ARMSTRONG had polled his delegation as to their wishes on limiting the construction to 29 apartments and the majority would not object.

Councilman Long moved that the change of zoning be granted with the restrictions that it be on a square footage basis equal to that of MR. STAUTZ, and the same kind of covenant be required that Mr. Stautz had when he built his apartments. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: Councilman LaRue

Councilman LaRue made the following statement concerning his vote:

"I would like to say that I voted for this change from "A" to "B" 1st Height and Area in 1964; and in 1965 this was brought into the entire area in question, and I do not think we have had a sufficient change in 1965 to justify this, and I think perhaps this again is a step in the direction of the entire area now changing to "B" 2nd Height and Area, I vote 'no'."

Mayor Palmer made the following statement concerning his vote:

"I would have felt too that the change had been too recent to justify or warrant the type of density that had been applied for originally. I do feel that this is a compromise on the zoning between the 36 apartments and the 28 or 29. As long as it is on the same ratio and same basis that we did for Mr. Stautz I vote 'aye' for the 29."

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence

2nd Height and Area with the restrictions that it be on a square footage basis equal to that of Mr. Stautz, and the same kind of covenant be required that Mr. Stautz had when he built his apartments; and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

H.H.H. & R. INC. 6509-6511 Berkman Drive
By Bryant-Curington,
Inc.

From "A" Residence 1st
Height & Area
To "B" Residence 2nd
Height & Area
AMENDED to "B" Residence
1st Height & Area
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission
as amended

MR. RICHARD BAKER representing the applicants, reported the application was reduced whereby a portion of the lot 137' in depth, was decided to be sufficient to protect the frontage on Hickman Avenue, and to provide a duplex lot which is the utilization of all the lots fronting on Hickman and reduced the remainder of the application from "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area to "B" Residence 1st Height and Area, which is the zoning on the adjacent lots. It was agreed that the applicants would give an easement for street purposes 20' in depth, and at such time as the improvements are undertaken, the land would be conveyed and deeded to the City without cost. MR. DALE HACHENBERG, 1621 Wheelless opposed a two story building but did not object to a single story structure. With the possibility of a Church going in soon, the street would not hold the traffic and parking, and there is no speed limit on Berkman coming off of Highway 290, and he reported there were no "yield right of way" or "stop" signs. The Mayor stated the speed limit was 30 miles per hour if it is not marked otherwise. MR. BAKER said his clients would accept the zoning as amended and recommended "B" Residence 1st Height and Area on the portion that fronts on Berkman and leaving the portion on Hickman approximately 137' deep; give the easement; and when construction commences, they would dedicate the right of way. Councilman Long moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be accepted. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence 1st Height and Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

J. T. McMILLIN 1109-1111 Stobaugh Street

From "A" Residence
To "C" Commercial
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

Councilman Shanks moved that the Council sustain the Planning Commission

in its recommendation and deny the zoning change. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been DENIED.

- - - - -

NORMA MAURINE	410 Park Lane	From "A" Residence 1st
CANTWELL	Rear of 408 Park Lane	Height & Area
By Wayne Walden	Additional Area	To "B" Residence 2nd
	412-414 Park Lane	Height & Area
	1404-1414 Newning Avenue	NOT Recommended by the
		Planning Commission

MR. WALDEN represented MRS. CANTWELL and one of the purchasers of this property. He had amended the request to "B" Residence 1st Height and Area before the Planning Commission. The opponents would not agree to the amended application. MR. WALDEN showed a plat and pointed out the areas that are other than single family dwellings. A multi-unit apartment house is under construction on the corner, and Newning Oaks 16-20 unit apartment was pointed out. The area is becoming rental property. His five unit apartment would be two story and would set back on the property with the parking in front. He said Mr. Mikuleneak had withdrawn his opposition. The development would not cause any parking problems nor add any more traffic in the area. They planned some two bedroom units; but would restrict if necessary the bedrooms to four one bedroom units. MR. EDDIE HUDSON was not objecting to this particular application, but stated there were three separate requests in this area to be considered today, and asked if the Council would consider all three together. MRS. M. C. BOATRIGHT said all of this area was "A" residential property, and it is essential to keep this residential to retain the beautiful open natural Stacy Park. A group of apartments would ruin the park. The children get to the park by bicycle and it would be terrible to turn that traffic down this street. MRS. STUART HARRIS said this was a lovely neighborhood of homeowners, and they all wanted this area to remain a good quality, quiet neighborhood. They did not object to a duplex on this property if it were well kept. MRS. O. G. MOORE stated there were no apartments in this area just duplexes. MR. WALDEN asked that his property be passed on separately as he was quite a distance from the park. He had other accesses to his property than going by the park. The Assistant City Attorney stated each application should be considered separately. Councilman White asked that this be postponed and that the Council go by and look at this site as well as the others. The Council postponed action until it could make an on-site inspection of the areas.

- - - - -

KIRK WILLIAMSON	509-513 Pecan Grove	From "A" Residence 1st
By Paul D. Jones	1414-1418 Sunset Lane	Height & Area
		To "B" Residence 2nd
		Height & Area
		NOT Recommended by the
		Planning Commission

MR. PAUL JONES represented the applicant, stating their request had been

amended before the Planning Commission from "B" Residence 1st Height and Area to "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area. He showed the three cases under consideration and pointed out the "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area zoning his clients tendered whatever right of way may be necessary. He discussed arguments regarding the park stating the park belonged to all the people. Mr. Jones said Mr. Hudson owns rental property in the area and opposes these zoning changes. The fact there is a demand for "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area as shown by the three applications within 500' of each other should be pointed out. Mr. Jones said the number of units would be limited due to the cliff and a draw on the property and the parking requirements would be met. MR. EDDIE HUDSON stated the neighborhood had kept the area up and made it attractive, and now the apartment developers want to come in. He called attention to the narrow street--one way, with no exit except via Bickler as Sunset Street does not exist in that area. Pecan Grove will be the main street. Mr. Hudson said there was no proposal before the Council. If the developer wants to build 31 units, he certainly would oppose that. It was stated under "B" Residence 1st Height and Area 15 units could be constructed. Mr. Hudson suggested if the applicants wanted to reduce the number of units, they should give the neighborhood a chance to reconsider it; and until a definite proposal is made, the Council should deny this request. MRS. M. C. BOATRIGHT spoke in opposition as this is "A" residential property, and there are many elderly people living in that neighborhood and they need protection. MRS. GLENN, on the corner of Bickler and Pecan Grove Road, stated there was quite a bit of traffic on these narrow streets, and more traffic would hamper residents from getting out of their driveway. All of the people are homeowners, they have a nice quiet neighborhood, and want to keep it that way. Councilman LaRue suggested that the Council go look at this area. The Council postponed action until it could make an on-site inspection of the area.

- - - - -

TRUMAN H. MONTANDON	301 East 38th Street	From "A" Residence
	3705-3709 Grooms Street	To "O" Office
		NOT Recommended by the
		Planning Commission

MR. MONTANDON proposed the zoning be changed to build a one doctor office for DR. MERVIN FATTER, Urologist. The office would open at 10:00 A.M. and close at 4:30 P.M. and his patients are received only on appointments. Parking will be in the rear of the lot. Mr. Montandon presented a list of 23 people within 300' of this property approving this change, and three others had written in to the Council. MR. FOE A. LAWRENCE spoke for the change submitting a list of seven people in favor. When 38th Street opened and the traffic count jumped from 4,619 cars to 9,205, the area was changed from residential to commercial. MRS. JACOBSON, representing her mother, favored the change because the street is a thoroughfare, and the area is not suitable for residential uses. Councilman Long suggested that this zoning be sent back to the Planning Commission for an area study and recommendation; as it is now, it would be a spot zoning. Mr. Lawrence pointed out a State rest-home; a multi-unit apartment house and a retail establishment already in the area. MR. A. M. SLACK, 3506 Tom Green, said there were several spots of commercial zoning, and he mentioned the City transmission station directly behind him, and his property was no longer residential. DR. FATTER explained a large percentage of his patients were elderly people between 70 and 90 years of age, and it was necessary to find a place for these people to get to easily. Students are using his parking areas and he needs to

June 16, 1966

move and plan for 10 or 15 years ahead to be ready for Medicare. He would have 100% off-street parking. Opposition was expressed by Mrs. Pennock, 3800 block of Avenue G, stating this is a small area; the lots were expensive and taxes are high. The homeowners chose to live there because it is a quiet neighborhood. Once a spot zone is given, the barriers are let down and all types of businesses come in. She filed a petition signed by adjacent property owners in opposition. MRS. J. E. GERBER, 3608 Grooms, said this was a very lovely old residential section, and there is no real traffic on Grooms. She was not bothered by the transformer, and it adds to the neighborhood, because the lawn is so well kept. She wanted to keep the area residential. MR. MONTANDON said Dr. Fatter is aware of the fact the street is to be widened; and to give the portion in the front to do the widening is satisfactory with him. The Assistant City Attorney discussed spot zoning when it was in conformity with a comprehensive plan or a developing pattern. Councilman Shanks stated the area has already changed. Councilman Long wanted to go look at this site and stated it might be well to ask the Planning Commission to make a study of the area. The Mayor stated it was recognized that 38th Street was one of the main cross-town streets, and the Council would go look at this and come up with an answer.

- - - - -

AUSTIN METER SERVICE 2111-2113 Shoalmont
By Tommy Smith Drive

From "A" Residence
To "C" Commercial
AMENDED to "C" Commercial for rear of 2111-2113 Shoalmont Drive and "O" Office for 2111-2113 Shoalmont Drive (E. 70' of Lot 8)
RECOMMENDED as amended by the Planning Commission

MR. TOMMY SMITH represented the applicant, stating the amendment as recommended would serve his purpose. MRS. HOMER MAYHALL stated the property is already being used as an office. She made a complaint on the noise from the Austin Meter Company beginning as early as 6:00 A.M. on Sunday mornings and continuing late at night. MRS. E. S. JOHNSON, 5501 Montview who owned her home and 139' on Shoalmont objected to this change to "C" Commercial. MR. TOMMY SMITH stated the Company purchased a portion of two lots. The only way they can expand is to go deep off of Burnet Road. The use of this property will be by a company called Techline, Inc., a distributor of electrical equipment--not a manufacturer. There will be no over-the-counter sales from this property, as the sales organization will go out into the field. The lower area for which they are asking "C" Commercial will be a warehouse. It is there, and they want to legalize it. The area facing Shoalmont will be the office area and they intend to operate out of the existing duplex. The property owners on Burnet Road have been given the opportunity to deepen their property. His access will be down the alley a private drive or easement, rather than off of Shoalmont. In connection with the zoning application they plan to resubdivide the property so it will conform with the zoning commission's recommendation. Councilman Long asked that the Council go look at this property. The Council postponed action until it could make an on-site inspection of the area.

- - - - -

June 16, 1966

MRS. MARIE SHIERLOW 1504-1512 East Side
By Charles Shierlow Drive

From "A" Residence
To "B" Residence
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

MR. ALVIS VANDYGRIFF represented the applicant, stating this tract is isolated, surrounded on two sides by park lands and on one side by a duplex. In the back there is a cliff or a barrier. MRS. BOATRIGHT stated she had lived there 19 years and continued to improve the property. She stated all the water from Newning drains from Mr. Sherman's yard to the back. Everything in the yard or the park comes floating right up to her back yard. If an apartment is placed down there it will be terrible. Mrs. Boatright stated Mrs. Bessie Miller also opposed this zoning. Councilman White wanted the Council to go look at this area. The Mayor stated the Council would go look at this and give an answer.

- - - - -

M. H. CROCKETT ESTATE 319-321 East 19th Street
By M. H. Crockett, Jr.

From "C" Commercial 2nd
Height & Area
To "C-1" Commercial 2nd
Height & Area
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman LaRue moved that the change be granted to "C-1" Commercial 2nd Height and Area. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C-1" Commercial 2nd Height and Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: A 6,500 SQUARE FOOT LOT, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 319-321 EAST 19TH STREET, FROM "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT TO "C-1" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Shanks moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

June 16, 1966

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman Shanks moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman Shanks moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The Council recessed until 2:30 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:30 P.M.

At 2:30 P.M. the Council resumed its meeting.

MAYOR PALMER announced MR. VICTOR SCHMIDT, Superintendent of Water and Sewer, had some very distinguished visitors to present before the Council. MR. SCHMIDT introduced four gentlemen from Ghana, new graduates from the University of Science and Technology, who are looking over the water and sewer facilities in Austin. Members of the group stated the people of Austin were very helpful, kind, and each was enjoying his visit in this beloved country. The Mayor on behalf of the City, expressed pleasure in having this group visit in Austin.

The Council had before it for consideration the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 BY ADDING THERETO A NEW CHAPTER PERTAINING TO THE REGULATION OF KINDERGARTENS AND CHILD-CARING FACILITIES, DESIGNATED CHAPTER 41; DEFINING TERMS; REQUIRING PERMITS FOR THE OPERATION OF A KINDERGARTEN AND A CHILD-CARING FACILITY; PRESCRIBING PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING PERMITS, INSPECTIONS, AND PAYMENT OF FEES; RESTRICTING TRANSFER OF PERMITS; SETTING FORTH MINIMUM OPERATIONAL STANDARDS; MAKING VIOLATION OF SUCH CHAPTER A MISDEMEANOR; PROVIDING A PROCEDURE FOR THE REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF PERMITS ISSUED UNDER SUCH CHAPTER AND APPEAL THEREFROM.

Mayor Palmer said the Council asked its Committee, with MR. JOHN SIMPSON, as Chairman, to meet with operators of kindergartens and child caring facilities to reconcile areas under concern. MR. SIMPSON reported the subcommittee headed by MRS. DILLON, MRS. LEE, MRS. SANCHEZ and DR. GENTRY and others did confer with

the various groups, and the ordinance as amended will not be out of line. All were very cooperative and he noted the absence of those interested indicated their acceptance of the changes. Each had been mailed a copy of the ordinance. The Assistant City Attorney, MR. BUTLER reviewed the changes in the ordinance, which provided coverage of both kindergartens and child caring facilities; reduction of the permit fee to \$15.00; deletion of reference to the food service establishment ordinance; deletion of provisions for fencing outside areas; and change of requirements for personnel. The Committee recommends that this amended ordinance become effective 90 days after its passage. MR. SIMPSON stated the Committee confined its efforts to health and sanitation and not in the realm of education. A representative from the Episcopalian Schools commended the Council wisdom in selecting Mr. Simpson as Chairman of this Committee, and stated their kindergarten could live with the ordinance and would cooperate. MAYOR PALMER read a narrative resolution and petition filed by Mrs. Williams to the effect every child in every group (kindergarten and child caring) in this city should be covered by the same ordinance thereby giving the City a check list on the supervision of young children through the City. MRS. JEFFREY asked for clarification about the Red Cross First Aid requirements, and DR. GENTRY said a nursing home course and day care course would be developed.

Councilman Long moved that the Council amend the ordinance which had been read through the first and second readings to make the corrections and to make it effective 90 days from today. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time with the corrections and Councilman Long moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilman Long moved that the Council express thanks and appreciation to the Committee, its Chairman, Mr. Simpson, the Staff, Dr. Primer, Mr. Hargis and the interested citizens who have given their time to help prepare this better ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its third reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 10.53 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE WM. CANNON LEAGUE IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS

THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN,
IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Flournoy's
Sweetbriar, Section 2)

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN
BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXA-
TION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF
18.66 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF
THE JOHN APPLGAIIT SURVEY IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS;
WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND
ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF
AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(Laurel Grove at Ianier, Section 1)

Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be published in accordance with Article 1, Section 6 of the Charter of the City of Austin and set for public hearing on June 30, 1966 at 10:30 A.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"June 13, 1966

"To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager SUBJECT: SALE OF HOUSES

"Bids were opened in my office June 13, 1966 at 10:00 a.m. for the sale of five houses that Urban Renewal has turned over to us for disposal by demolition.

"Bids from two different individuals were received and a breakdown of the bidding is as follows:

	1407 Hackberry	1404 Rosewood	1508 Rosewood	1508 (R) Rosewood	1510-12 Rosewood
W. Johnston	<u>\$156.50</u>	<u>\$147.50</u>	<u>\$27.50</u>	<u>\$12.50</u>	<u>\$37.50</u>
A. Heyer	87.61	131.62	18.61	<u>36.71</u>	27.74

"The high bid on each house is underscored in red. Due to the fact that these structures are dilapidated and also the fact that it would cost this office several hundred dollars if we had to demolish them, it is recommended that these

June 16, 1966

bids be accepted.

"If the bids are acceptable, the contracts will be forwarded to you for your signature, and should be returned to me for attestation and distribution.

"From: Dick T. Jordan, Building
Official

Signed Dick T. Jordan"

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on June 13, 1966, for the sale of five (5) houses that Urban Renewal Agency has turned over to the City for disposal by demolition; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of W. Johnston, in the sum of \$156.50 for house located at 1407 Hackberry, in the sum of \$147.50 for house located at 1404 Rosewood, in the sum of \$27.50 for house located at 1508 Rosewood, and in the sum of \$37.50 for house located at 1510-1512 Rosewood, and the bid of A. Heyer, in the sum of \$36.71 for house located at 1508 (R) Rosewood, were the highest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids has been recommended by the Building Official of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the above enumerated bids of W. Johnston and A. Heyer, be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts, on behalf of the City of Austin with W. Johnston and A. Heyer.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The City Manager stated there were two petitions asking that Indian Trail in the 2000 and 2100 blocks, Dormarion Lane and Sharon Lane in the 2400 block; and West 8th and West 9th Streets in the 2300-2400 blocks, Deep Eddy, Wayside Drive, Possum Trot and Pruett Street be fogged. Councilman Shanks moved that these streets be fogged as petitioned. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The City Manager reported GLASTRON BOAT COMPANY asked permission to place power boats in Town Lake in front of Fiesta Gardens for two days for the purpose of taking pictures, for advertising their products. Something comparable was permitted last year. They are asking to keep the boats in the water two days; and in case of bad weather they would like to extend that time two days. The dates are June 20-24, but they will require only two days of that period. The picture taking will occur between 8:00 A.M. - 4:00 P.M. Councilman Shanks moved that the request be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman LaRue moved that the request for a Sunday Dance at the Coliseum on June 19th, a Fathers Day Dance, as requested by Victor Pobanco, be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager stated the University of Texas is interested in acquiring small remnants of property which the City owns in the vicinity between the creek and San Jacinto north of 26 $\frac{1}{2}$ Street. The University has agreed to pay the appraised amount. Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a warranty deed on behalf of the City of Austin, conveying to the University of Texas the following described property, to-wit:

Two (2) tracts of land, each of the said two (2) tracts of land being out of and a part of Moore Subdivision, a subdivision of Outlot 10, Division D, of the Government Outlots adjoining the Original City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Government Outlots on file in the General Land Office of the State of Texas; a map or plat of said Moore Subdivision being of record in Book 1 at page 107 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas; the tract of land hereinafter described as Number One being out of and a part of Lots 10 and 11 and those certain portions of Lots 12, 13 and 14, Block 4, said Moore Subdivision, and containing 0.283 of one acre of land and the tract of land hereinafter described as Number Two being out of and a part of Lot 4, Block 2, said Moore Subdivision, and containing 0.035 of one acre of land; which Lots 10 and 11 and portions of Lots 12, 13 and 14, Block 4 and Lot 4, Block 2, Moore Subdivision, were conveyed, together with other property, to the City of Austin, a municipal corporation, by the following three (3) warranty deeds:

- (1) Dated November 19, 1928, of record in Volume 428, at page 444 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas;
- (2) Dated March 9, 1929, of record in Volume 434 at page 275 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas;
- (3) Dated April 12, 1929, of record in Volume 436 at

page 133 of the Deed Records of Travis County,
Texas;

Each of the said two (2) tracts of land being more particularly
described by metes and bounds as follows:

NUMBER ONE, BEGINNING at the intersection of the south line of San Jacinto Boulevard, formerly known as Waller Creek Boulevard, and the west line of Wooldridge Street for the most easterly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the said west line of Wooldridge Street, S 05° 24' W 59.61 feet to the most southerly corner of the herein described tract of land, from which point the southeast corner of said Lot 14 bears S 05° 24' W 14.94 feet;

THENCE, N 48° 29' W 185.86 feet to a point in the west line of said Lot 12, same being the east line of an existing alley, for the most westerly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the said east line of an existing alley, N 05° 24' E 109.68 feet to its intersection with the curving south line of San Jacinto Boulevard, said curve having an angle of intersection of 33° 41', a radius of 581.07 feet and a tangent distance of 175.90 feet, for the most northerly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, along said curving south line of San Jacinto Boulevard to the left an arc distance of 71.67 feet, the chord of which arc bears S 35° 28' E 71.59 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve;

THENCE, continuing with the said south line of San Jacinto Boulevard, S 39° 00' E 147.65 feet to the point of beginning.

NUMBER TWO, BEGINNING at the intersection of the west line of the aforesaid City of Austin tract of land as described in Volume 428 at Page 444 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas, same being the west line of Lot 4, Block 2, in the aforesaid Moore Subdivision, same also being the east line of an existing alley, with the southwest line of San Jacinto Boulevard, formerly known as Waller Creek Boulevard, and which point of beginning is the most northerly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the northeast line of said City of Austin tract of land, same being said southwest line of San Jacinto Boulevard, S 25° 00' E 40.00 feet to the point of curvature of a curve having an angle of intersection of 34° 25', a radius of 330.70 feet and a tangent distance of 102.42 feet;

THENCE, along said curve to the right an arc distance of 23.10 feet, the chord of which arc bears S 23° 00' E 23.10 feet to the most easterly corner of the herein described tract of land, same also being a point in the curving wing wall of a bridge, same being the curving north line of East 26-1/2 Street, said curve having an angle of intersection of 120° 44', a radius of 63.00 feet and a tangent distance of 110.75 feet;

THENCE, along said curve to the right an arc distance of 47.24 feet, the chord of which arc bears S 48° 00' W 46.15 feet to a point in the aforesaid west line of the City of Austin tract of land, same being the aforesaid west line of Lot 4, Block 2, in the said Moore Subdivision, same also being the aforesaid

June 16, 1966

east line of an existing alley, for the most southerly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with said west line of the City of Austin tract of land, same being said west line of Lot 4, Block 2, in said Moore Subdivision, same also being said east line of an existing alley, N 05° 24' E 88.78 feet to the point of beginning.

THERE is to be retained, however, a public utility and drainage easement in, upon and across the entirety of the tract of land described above as Number Two, and a drainage easement is to be retained in, upon and across a portion of the tract of land described above as Number One, said portion of Tract Number One being more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

BEGINNING at the intersection of the south line of San Jacinto Boulevard and the west line of Wooldridge Street for the most easterly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the said west line of Wooldridge Street in a southerly direction to the most southerly corner of Tract Number One described above for the most southerly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, in a northwesterly direction to the southwest corner of Lot 11 for the most westerly corner of the herein described tract of land, same being a point in the east line of an existing alley;

THENCE, with the said east line of an existing alley in a northerly direction to its intersection with the aforesaid south line of San Jacinto Boulevard, for the most northerly corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the said south line of San Jacinto Boulevard in a southeasterly direction to the point of beginning.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Councilman Long

The City Manager had a note from MR. FRANCIS VICKERS, Auditorium Manager, pointing out when carnivals operate in the area of the Auditorium and Coliseum there is a lot of cleaning up to be done. The cost for the last carnival ran \$110.00. It was Mr. Vickers' recommendation that a charge of \$20.00 a day be installed for cleaning the grounds around the area when carnivals have been operating. Councilman Long moved that the Council accept the recommendation of the City Manager that a charge of \$20.00 a day be made for carnivals that are operating. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman White moved that the Minutes of the Meeting of June 9, 1966 be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

June 16, 1966

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor noted it was 3:30 P.M. and it was the time set for a public hearing on an amendment to the Austin Development Plan, involving property at the northwest corner of Rutherford Lane and Cameron Road. The Director of Planning pointed out the area on the map and described the road system. In addition to this described property is land belonging to KARL WAGNER, and a nearly completed subdivision belonging to GILBRETH, MILBURN, JOE CROW and CHRIS CROW. The 20 acre tract became of concern when inquiries were made for utilities to a proposed manufacturing plant site called INFROTRONICS. Approximately 700 acres have been designated in the plan for low density residential development. Consideration was given to adjacent areas--the land to the east which probably will be developed residential; and that to the south which likely will be commercial and semi-industrial. After working on several ideas, they came up with the "Planned Development Area" based on the idea a plan would be submitted with intermixing of uses, and there would be control of the particular development conditions and future operational conditions. The intent in the Text of the Development Plan is not to apply this to industrial situations only, but to other situations where there is intermixing of uses. In the 22 acres along Cameron Road, residential would not be permitted. Councilman White inquired about the area between Rutherford Lane and Loop 111. The Planning Director stated Mr. Joseph and Mr. McClure might consider this not under the Planned Development Area but under the category of commercial and semi-industrial rather than residential.

MAYOR PALMER summarized what was before the Council is the amendment to the Development Plan to add to Chapter II, the provisions of a "Planned Development Area" and to designate 82.5 acres for commercial-industrial with an attached plan. Councilman Long asked if this would be saying the City would supply utilities. The City Manager said if the uses proposed meet the requirement of the Master Plan, then there has been removed one limitation against serving the area. The financial arrangements still would have to be worked out.

MR. S. A. GARZA, Consulting Engineer, said all concerned were aware of the amendment. He introduced those who had been working on this program--the Planning Staff, MR. EDDIE JOSEPH; MR. PAUL WILLIAMS and MR. HUFFMAN with Infrotronics; and MR. JACK GRAY, Chamber of Commerce. The request was to designate the 20 acres for Infrotronics, and they had gone over the specifications, and Mr. Osborne had explained to them the conditions of this planned area. Mr. Joseph stated the area had been reduced to the least possible amount for a development such as this. MR. WALTER KNETSCH inquired how this amendment would affect his $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres. The Planning Director read the uses permitted other than residential uses within the area. (Page 3, Paragraph II).

MR. KARL WAGNER, owner of property just east of Mr. Joseph's was not opposed to the use of the 20 acres for Infrotronics, but his concern was in labeling these areas, as the labels stay with the area. There is more property available for industrial use than there are industries; and that being the case, his property would ultimately be residential. He feared a lot of vacant unused industrial land would hurt the residential area that is developing. This area represents 600-800 acres.

MR. JOE CROW expressed favor of this designation, stating it seems that planning has followed the economic forces that develop the property rather than

planning causing the development of property; and this he favored, as the economic forces determine the development. He had no fear about protection, stating he would take chances of the economic forces. He feared "A" residence zoning more than he would industrial zoning. He did not think there would be any objection to industrial uses anywhere, if nice buildings were erected. If the industrial proposition is not consumed for industrial uses, he suggested turning it loose for residential uses.

MR. J. B. ALBRIGHT, owner of 30 acres across Cameron Road, stated he objected to this proposition at first, and would still be opposed except for this new category as proposed by Mr. Osborne's amendment, and he was heartily in favor of it.

MR. TOM BRADFELD discussed with the Planning Engineer the Planned Development Plan, stating he had not understood there would be residential uses intermingled, but that the planned development was to accomodate a number of uses in a compatible harmonious way--not including residential uses. Also there was discussed limited sizes of these plans--9 or 10 acres, but there is nothing in the proposed amendment which sets out these determinations. The Planning Director explained the items of Mr. Bradfield's concern. Mr. Bradfield said the Planned Development was a better approach than industrial zoning. Had planned development been in effect a few weeks ago, there would not be the problem that has arisen with another electronics industry. Mayor Palmer asked Mr. Bradfield if he did agree with this concept. Mr. Bradfield said it is fine, but it does not go far enough. The City Manager stated with regard to this discussion that the text is flexible. The particular plan prepared and worked out with the owner and the Planning Commission is not flexible, as that is the way the owners want it.

Councilman Long moved that the Austin Development Plan be amended to provide for "Planned Development Areas" as follows:

To Be Added to CHAPTER II, "THE LAND USE PLAN":

Planned Development Areas

Traditional land use planning and the primary means of implementing the land use plans, zoning, have been characterized by the fairly rigid separation of uses into different categories or zones. Residential uses were segregated from commercial and industrial uses. Single-family and two-family houses were segregated from apartments and other forms of multi-family housing.

Planned development provisions mark a substantial departure from tradition. They are intended to recognize that through careful planning and design coupled with sound development controls and performance standards, a "mixing" or careful association of various uses can occur and at the same time promote the health, welfare and safety in the community's development. In general, planned development regulations are intended to be applied to medium and large tracts where there is greater flexibility in working out the detailed development problems however it is recognized that there may be instances of relatively small tracts, especially involving fairly intense development, where such provisions can be effectively used.

The Land Use section of the Austin Development Plan designates eleven major use categories ranging from Suburban Residential to Manufacturing and Related Uses. These use areas are located on the Land Use Plan map. The Planned Development Area would constitute a twelfth category. A Planned Development Area would be established in a particular location as the need and desirability for such a designation was established and approved by the City. In addition to locating and establishing such a designation in the Land Use Plan, it would be required that the following elements be incorporated as part of the provisions for the particular Planned Development Area:

1. A schematic plan showing principal land uses, streets, buffer areas and other design and physical features necessary to determine the nature and feasibility of the proposed development and its relationship to existing or proposed development.
2. A set of proposed development standards or controls. These may include but are not limited to set-back and yard requirements, bulk and height provisions, specific use provisions, buffer or screening provisions, sign or other accessory structure conditions, specific site plans, parking locations and standards and such other design and development provisions as may implement the Planned Development Area.
3. A set of proposed performance standards. These may include but are not limited to maximum noise levels, vibration standards, smoke and particulate matter standards, light or glare provisions, toxic or noxious matter standards, regulation of fire and explosive hazards and disposal of liquid or solid wastes.
4. Proposed means of providing for streets, public utilities, public facilities, open areas, services and such other elements as may be deemed necessary in determining the nature and feasibility of the proposed Planned Development.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Attorney stated there had not been time to go through all of the text and balance of the plan to see if there might be any inconsistencies between this and anything else that would require additional changes. The plan could be amended now and later when there has been time to analyze the balance of the plan, the changes could be brought back to the Council. Councilman White asked how long this would take. The City Attorney stated about a week or ten days. The City Manager stated that he would assume the Council's action today is such that work could proceed on utilities, etc.

The Planning Director filed with the City Clerk the corrected copy of the amendment.

Councilman Long moved that the Council adopt the following "Planned Development Area":

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AREA (COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ADJACENT TO RESIDENTIAL) PROVISIONS FOR AREA LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF CAMERON ROAD AND RUTHERFORD LANE, EXTENDING NORTH ALONG CAMERON ROAD TO LITTLE WALNUT CREEK

- I. SUBMISSION OF SCHEMATIC PLAN: Plan should show proposed industrial or commercial areas, principal streets to be widened or developed, adjacent future residential areas and relationship of proposed industrial and commercial areas to existing or future residential development.

II. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

Purpose: This Planned Development Area is intended to provide suitable and conducive environment for the development of modern administrative facilities, research establishments, specialized manufacturing plants, and similar enterprises plus retail and other customer service facilities, all of which can conform to a high level of development and performance standards and be complimentary and not intrude upon nearby existing or future residential and associated development.

A. Uses:

1. No residential use shall be permitted within the Area except for a watchman or custodian in conjunction with each commercial or industrial use.
2. No outdoor storage or display of materials or products shall be permitted.
3. Uses permitted shall include:

Offices, financial and related facilities
Business services
Sale of professional or business supplies
Convenience goods sales
Shopper's goods and other retail facilities
Personal service shops
Automobile and related equipment repair where conducted entirely within building
Storage and warehousing
Commercial laundry
Moving and hauling
Wholesale distribution
Manufacturing or processing where conducted as follows:

- a. All operations shall be within a fully enclosed building
- b. All activities shall be conducted in such a way as to comply with the attached performance standards.
- c. Articles produced or processed shall be of moderately high to high value relative to bulk and thus likely to generate low truck traffic.

(The attached list of uses are indicative of those which would be permitted in this Planned Development Area.)

B. Bulk and Area Provisions:

Minimum Lot Area:	12,000 sq.ft.	
Min. lot width:	100 ft.	
Lot Coverage:	25%	
Floor area ratio:	0.5	
Height:	35 ft.	
Front set-back:	(For building: 50 ft.) (For parking: 25 ft.)	
Side Yard:	Adjacent to Com. or Ind.	Adjacent to Residential
(Building)	15 ft.	35 ft.
(Parking)	0	20 ft.
Rear Yard:	Adjacent to Com. or Ind.	Adjacent to Residential
(Building)	15 ft.	35 ft.
(Parking)	0	20 ft.
Side Street Set-back:	(For building: 30 ft.) (For parking: 15 ft.)	

C. Signs:

1. No sign shall project above the roof line of the building
2. No flashing or intermittently lighted signs permitted and lighted signs shall be indirectly lighted.
3. Signs attached to the building shall not exceed 50 sq. ft. in total area per sign.
4. Detached signs shall not exceed 32 sq. ft. in total area per sign.
5. Not more than one detached sign for each 100 lineal feet of lot frontage shall be permitted.

D. Off-Street Parking:

Offices and related facilities:	1/300 sq. ft. of floor area
Rental and personal service shops:	1/200 sq. ft. of floor area
Business services:	1/300 sq. ft. of floor area
Automobile and related equipment repair:	1/500 sq. ft. of floor area
Moving, storage and warehousing:	1/500 sq. ft. of floor area
Commercial laundry and similar:	1/500 sq. ft. of floor area
Wholesale distribution:	1/400 sq. ft. of floor area
Manufacturing or processing:	1/300 sq. ft. of floor area of office, manufacturing and related supply space; 1/500 sq. ft. for warehousing and storage space.

III. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

The attached performance standards shall apply to all commercial, industrial and other non-residential development occurring in the Planned Development Area.

IV. STREETS, UTILITIES AND OTHER FACILITIES:

Prior to development of a particular site, the associated street or streets shall be dedicated and provision made for their improvement at such time as

it is determined that they are needed. Where feasible, provision shall be made for public utilities and such other public facilities as may be necessary to the proper development of the area.

Performance Standards

General

No land or structure in this Planned Development Area shall be used or occupied in any manner so as to create any dangerous, injurious, noxious, or otherwise objectionable noise, smoke, dust or other form of air pollution, liquid or solid refuse or wastes, or other substance, condition, or element in such a manner or in such amount as to adversely affect any use or premises within the vicinity; the foregoing are hereinafter referred to as "dangerous or objectionable elements."

Locations Where Determinations Are to Be Made for Enforcement Standards

The determination of the existence of dangerous and objectionable elements shall be made:

Noise, Vibration, and Glare

At the location of the use creating the same at a point on the source property line which has the highest readings, and at any other points where the existence of such elements may be more apparent.

Smoke, Toxic, and Noxious Matter

At the place of emission into the atmosphere.

Dangerous and Objectionable Elements

Noise

At the points of measurement, the maximum sound pressure level radiated by any use or facility (other than transportation facilities or temporary construction work) shall not exceed the decibel limit values for the octave bands given in Table 1. The sound pressure level shall be measured with a Sound Level Meter and associated Octave Band Analyzer conforming to standards prescribed by the American Standards Association. (American Standard Sound Level Meters for Measurement of Noise and Other Sounds, 224.3-1944, American Standards Association Inc., New York, N.Y., and American Standard Specification for an Octave-Band Filter Set for the Analysis of Noise and Other Sounds, 224.10-1953, American Standards Association Inc., New York, N.Y., or latest approved revisions thereof on the date of adoption of this Ordinance shall be used.)

TABLE 1

Frequency Ranges Containing
Standard Octave Bands in
Cycles per Second

Octave Band Sound Pressure
Level in Decibels re 0.0002
dyne/square centimeter

20 to 75
75 to 150

72
67

150 to 300	59
300 to 600	56
600 to 1,200	53
1,200 to 2,400	50
2,400 to 4,800	44
above 4,800	38

Between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6.00 a.m., the permissible sound levels shall be three decibels less than shown above.

Measurements shall be made, less background noises from other sources, using the flat network and the slow position of the sound level meter.

Vibration

At the points of measurements, earthborne vibrations from any operation or plan shall not exceed the limits set forth in Column I below for the area in which located, unless the point of measurement is located on a property line which is also the boundary line of a residential area or within eighty feet of a residential area boundary line which is located within a street right-of-way, in which case the limits set forth in Column II below shall apply.

TABLE II

Frequency Cycles per Second	Column I* Displacement (inches) District	Column II* Displacement (inches)
0 to 10	.0010	.0004
10 to 20	.0008	.0002
20 to 30	.0005	.0001
30 to 40	.0004	.0001
40 and over	.0003	.0001

*Steady State -- vibrations, for the purpose of this Ordinance, which are continuous or more frequent than sixty pulses per minute. Impact vibration, those less frequent than sixty pulses per minute, shall not cause more than twice the displacement stipulated.

Glare

Any operation or activity producing intense glare shall be performed in such a manner as not to create a nuisance or hazard across lot lines. Direct illumination from any source of light or direct welding flash shall be screened from adjoining properties and reflected light from these sources shall not exceed 0.4 foot candles across the source property line.

Smoke and Particulate Matter

Smoke emitted from any vent, stack, chimney, skylight, window, building opening, or combustion process shall not exceed any opacity of Ringelmann No. 1 as observed on the Ringelmann Chart. However, once during any six hour period, Ringelmann No. 2 will be permitted but not for longer than five minutes.

The emission of particulate matter from all sources shall not exceed one pound per acre of property within the boundary of any plat site under consideration during any one hour. Dust coarser than forty-four microns shall be limited to 0.05 pounds per acre of property during any one hour.

Open industrial operations involving dust-producing or dust-causing equipment or operations such as sandblasting, paint spraying, feed and grain handling, and similar operations, shall be so conducted that such dusts do not cross lot lines in concentrations exceeding one million particles per cubic foot when measured at ground level or habitable elevation, at or beyond the lot line, whichever is more restrictive.

Toxic and Noxious Matter

In no case shall the concentrations of toxic or noxious matter be released across source lot lines which will exceed ten percent of the concentration (exposure) considered as the threshold limit for an industrial worker. Reference is made to the most recent publication, at the time of adoption of this Ordinance, of "Threshold Limit Values" adopted by the Texas State Board of Health in accordance with authority granted in Article 4418d of the Revised Civil Statutes of Texas.

Fire and Explosive Hazards

Activities involving the storage and utilization of materials or products which decompose by detonation are permitted only when specifically approved by the City of Austin Fire Department. Such materials shall include but are not limited to all primary explosives such as lead azide, lead styphnate, fulminates and tetracene; all high explosives such as TNT, HMX, PETN, and picric acid; propellants and components thereof such as nitrocellulose, black powder, boron hydrides, hydrazine and its derivatives; pyrotechnics and fireworks such as magnesium powder, potassium chlorate, and potassium nitrate; blasting explosives such as dynamite and nitroglycerin; unstable organic compounds such as acetylides, tetrazoies, and ozonides; strong oxidizing agents such as perchloric acid, perchlorates chlorates, and hydrogen peroxide in concentrations greater than thirty-five percent; and nuclear fuels, fissionable materials and products, and reactor elements such as Uranium 235 and Plutonium 239.

Explosives shall be stored, utilized, and manufactured in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal codes.

All applications for building permits for uses involving fire and explosive hazards may be referred by the Building Inspector to the office of the City of Austin Fire Department for approval. Such approval shall indicate compliance with all applicable fire codes and ordinances of the City of Austin and shall be indicated on the application within ten days from the date such application was made in the office of the Building Inspector.

Liquid or Solid Wastes

No discharge shall be made into a public sewer, private sewage disposal system, stream, or into the ground unless in accordance with the

June 16, 1966

standards approved by the State Department of Health or substitute equivalent standards applicable for similar uses which because of the nature of temperature of the material discharge can contaminate any water supply, interfere with the bacterial processes in sewage treatment, or otherwise cause the emission of dangerous or offensive elements.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

MAYOR PALMER extended a cordial welcome to MR. PAUL WILLIAMS and his firm. Councilman Shanks stated Mr. Williams had looked all over the United States trying to find a place and chose Austin.

The Mayor announced the Council received a communication this morning from MR. PAT CAIN stating he would like to appear before the Council. MR. CAIN said in order to let the people know what their project of "Little Texas" would mean to the City, they had presented the proposal to various groups which he introduced.

MR. WAYNE WEDDELL, Vice President, Tourism and Recreation Committee, read a statement from the Chamber of Commerce to the effect the Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors recognize "Little Texas" as a good project in principle, is managed by people of good character and reputation, and urged the City Council to reopen negotiations. MR. E. M. LAWRENCE, President Junior Chamber of Commerce stated their Board urged the Council to exhaust all channels to start negotiations with the "Little Texas" group; that this is a worthwhile project and Austin will become one of the main tourists attractions as the result of this development. MR. MILTON WEBB, Service Station Association, endorsed "Little Texas" as being good for the City of Austin. MR. ROBERT FARQUHAR, President, Austin Motel Association, reported the Motel Association felt this was very worthy, and were behind the project, and urged the Council to reconsider this proposal.

MR. CAIN filed a resolution adopted by the AUSTIN RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION recognizing "Little Texas" as a good project in principle, developed and managed by people of good character and reputation and urging the Council to reopen negotiations with the developers of "Little Texas". Mr. Cain stated MR. GILES SPILLAR was to present this, but due to a death in his family, he was unable to be here. DOWNTOWN AUSTIN, UNLIMITED, endorsed the project by letter from MR. MERLE BROWN.

MR. CAIN distributing a plat showing the proposed acreage, peninsula, island and greenbelt, stated the "Little Texas" project was presented to the various groups as to its location on Town Lake and as to what the estimates of the attendance could mean dollarwise to the citizens of Austin. He said there were some petitions endorsing this, and they could be brought in if the Council desired.

MR. CAIN reviewed the new proposal, to lease the Travis Materials lease on the south bank of Town Lake and the area across the Pleasant Valley Road of 43.7 acres totaling approximately 87 acres of land and water on Town Lake and to the east of Pleasant Valley Road for a primary term of 30 years, options to

extend the lease exclusive to lessee for either four additional five year periods or two additional ten year periods, or any combination thereof, with the right of first refusal thereafter on terms to be mutually agreeable.

He listed the following schedules:

Normal ground rent until operations begin, such as

1. \$5,000 first year of lease
2. \$10,000 second year and until operations begin

A percentage rental schedule after operations begin, such as

- 8% of the annual gross income of the operation to \$2,000,000
- 9% of the gross on the million dollars from \$2 to \$3,000,000
- 10% of the gross on the million between \$3 and \$4,000,000
- 11% on the million between \$4 and \$5,000,000
- 12% of the gross on the money received above \$5,000,000 and a guarantee of at least

1. \$100,000 per year for the first five years of operation
2. \$150,000 a year for the second five years of operation
3. \$200,000 a year for the third five years of operation
4. \$250,000 a year for the fourth five years of operation and thereafter

Recapture provisions should be on the basis of:

Market value during the entire term of the lease
or

Invested capital, including organizational expense, less depreciation, plus 5% of the invested capital for loss of future earnings, whichever amount is smaller.

Instead of an option on the entire Capitol Aggregates' lease, they would need an option for only some 15 acres of that now presently leased by Capitol Aggregates, Inc. adjoining the Travis Materials' lease on Town Lake for further expansion of the Park.

Councilman Long inquired about his meaning of "market value". Mr. Cain stated it would be the business, the operation--the Little Texas operation, and the market value would include all appraisal techniques. Discussion covered what would be considered in market value.

Councilman Long discussed the various properties to be under lease and noted that the peninsula had been cut away from the bank. Mr. Cain stated this was merely a demonstration as to what could occur. He discussed the option on the 15 acres of water and land to work out an agreement with the City and Capitol Aggregates, Inc., to build peninsulas. He stated they had attempted to solve as many of the exceptions that the Parks Board had for their approval of the project in principle--they had abandoned their request for any land on the north side of the lake; provided parking; and had consummated an agreement with the Kassuba Corporation as far as his clients were concerned to leave the land open and unimproved, as they do not need that area; and the architects are solving

June 16, 1966

the buffer zones around the property.

Councilman Long asked if Mr. Cain would have any objections to having this proposition put up for competitive bids. Mr. Cain had no objections, stating care would have to be taken on what the proposition would be on which they would bid. He said this ~~was~~ meritorious proposition, and they had the people capable of putting it together and performing; and the matter had been open so far as they were concerned thus far. The specifications would be very tricky, and he said they would be concerned about them.

Mayor Palmer read communications endorsing "Little Texas" from the Junior Chamber of Commerce, MRS. J. L. RUMSEY, and a letter from the A.I.A. stating a five man trustee group with LEONARD LUNGREN, Chairman, had been appointed to work with the Mayor and Council in studying land use problems, and they had begun their studies and would arrive at their first group of findings within a few days.

Mr. Cain asked the Council to hear MR. J. BARNES' architectural projection of "Little Texas". Mr. Barnes showed a sketch of the proposed use plan showing the exact area--the 43.7 acres east of Pleasant Valley Road, which will be used for parking; the 12.7 acres west of Pleasant Valley Road which would be the Little Texas development and which would have the rides, historical and education buildings, etc; and 24 additional acres. In no way does this area get out into the main bed of the river. Great attention would be given to landscaping, to the types and forms of buildings, the buffer zones to protect the surrounding property, the development, the islands, and beautifying of the shoreline. The project would be an educational and historical center. Instead of fencing, there would be landscaping and sculpturing of the earth in order to provide buffer zones. The thoroughfare probably would be overpassed. He described a sky-ride which would cross to the island and to the peninsula, making possible a tremendous impressive view of the skyline of Austin and of the Lake. There would be a train ride, a mock battleship, carrying out some of the history of Galveston; a submarine ride, three show boats circling in the area with continuous shows. The peninsula would be landscaped. The whole project would be a high type first class development which would be educational, historical, and which would be an excellent family type of entertainment. Envisioned were fountains, impressive lighting, ponds, pleasant places in which to stroll, walks, and landscaping; and a barge that would go back and forth from this site to the island. The development would be \$3,500,000 and an excess of 800 people in the University class would be employed. He said it would be a tremendous asset to Austin.

MR. FISH understood that the Planning Department had plans, the Wise & Associates, and the Town Lake Development Plans designated the area as a district park. It was pointed out at no time was there a District Park included in any plan. Mr. Fish urged the Council to look carefully into the promoting and responsibilities, and the business arrangements. MR. WILLIAM E. ROTH read a statement regarding conservation of natural beauty.

MRS. W. W. STEWART stated she saw no damage to an individual nor to the City by having this development. She owned land immediately adjacent to this property, and said it would be well to have all this developed beauty and bring the money into the City at the same time.

MR. JOE SAULEN, a newcomer to Austin suggested that some of the funds from this activity be earmarked for crippled children or something that would help handicapped children or citizens. The Mayor explained large sums were

appropriated for various purposes like these from the General Fund; but as far as designating revenue from a swimming pool or golf course or specific activity that is not done.

COUNCILMAN LARUE expressed pleasure in seeing the number of people present, and in the fact that Mr. Cain had received such wonderful acceptance from all of the people and endorsements in principle. He said the presentation today was indicative of what might be expected from the public if they are informed. He said perhaps one of the best ways to illustrate what the public could expect today is to compare this proposal with the one presented to the Council several weeks ago, and he thought there could be no question or doubt in the minds of the public about what they are getting, or what this proposal is.

In comparing the aspects of the proposal, he pointed out the original presentation was a request for 146 acres, inclusive of water and land surface. The present proposal is for 86 acres.

As to the guarantees proposed in the original lease, there was only \$750.00 a month, amounting to some \$9,000 per year. Taking the same primary term of lease as presented today which is 30 years and multiplying \$9,000 per year guarantee, \$270,000 would be the total. In the present proposition the guarantees are as follows:

First five years	-	\$100,000 per year
Second five years	-	\$150,000 per year
Third five years	-	\$200,000 per year
The next 13 years	-	\$250,000 per year

For a primary term of some 30 years, and comparable to using the same number of years in the prior proposition, the total would be \$5,515,000 as compared to the \$270,000 guarantee. He said the public would be well pleased and more inclined to look favorably upon this proposition. This would be approximately 20 times of what the original proposal was.

The percentages which could be taken in lieu of the figures just quoted, the original quotation on gate receipts was 8%, and this was for the entire term of the lease, the primary term being 50 years plus five ten year options. The proposal as presented today is as follows:

8%	for the first \$2,000,000
9%	for the second additional million dollars
10%	for the next \$1,000,000
11%	for the next million
12%	for all over \$5,000,000.

There were no projections on the internal sales and this estimate was not made.

The present proposal as presented today indicates some 30 years as a primary term of the lease with either four five year options or two ten year options. This would be again compared with your fifty year original presentation.

The recapture clause was one of the very difficult things to accept as proposed originally. During the first five years of the primary term, the gate receipts exclusively were to be approximately \$3,000,000. The proposal required if the City, under any circumstances, needed to acquire the property during the

June 16, 1966

fifth year, it would cost the City some \$30,000,000 and that price would be based exclusively on the gate receipts and not on the internal sales, because there were no projections. If the internal sales might have reached \$2 to \$3,000,000 the required amount for the City to recover this property in case of necessity during the fifth year, would probably have been somewhere between \$50 and \$60,000,000 taking a low estimate.

Councilman LaRue stated another thing that was in question in the original presentation, and as indicated in the present proposal, that would need some interpretation before it could be accepted, would be "present fair market value". He said there would not be too much difficulty in arriving at the cost or value of this property if the City, by necessity, had to recover it. If this information is given to the public so they would have no problem whatever in determining in their opinion the value of this, and compare the two figures, perhaps a favorable acceptance from the public would be received.

He suggested to be doubly sure there is no misunderstanding, that it would be well if the newspaper could print the proposal as it was originally presented to the City Council, and then again along side of that, present the proposition the Council received today.

In response to Mayor Palmer's question if he would accept this proposal today, Councilman LaRue stated he would not now in view of the terms of the resolution passed some two or three weeks ago.

Councilman Long stated in view of the new proposal, the new projection with the outlined area, and the reduction of land that was to be considered; the omission of the north shoreline and the Kassuba Beach area, that the proposal is certainly far more acceptable, and it would warrant the Parks and Recreation Board and the A.I.A.'s going over it, making a study and bringing back a recommendation.

Councilman Long moved that this new proposal be sent to the Parks and Recreation Board and the A.I.A. for their study and review, and that they be asked to bring it back to the Council as soon as they possibly can. The motion was seconded by Councilman LaRue.

Discussion to the motion was held. Councilman Shanks asked for some indication of intent that the Council would be interested in this proposal. He said he had full confidence in the Council that it could sit down and negotiate, and noted it had never negotiated with these people. He emphasized the terms of the lease are the Council's responsibility and he did not want to relinquish the Council's right to negotiate a lease.

Councilman White stated before the 19th of this last month, three of the Council did not know anything about Little Texas. It seemed somebody had negotiated but there were three that were not negotiating and knew nothing about it until they came to the Council table and that lease was on the table to be passed that day. The Mayor said that none of the Council Members had ever seen that lease until it came to the Council. As to the Council's previous action, the City Manager reported the Council had directed him to work with the group to try to come up with something to recommend to the Council. Councilman White stated the Council told the City Manager a long time ago when this came up on another site, which was found to be insufficient, the Council said at that time that Mr. Williams would have to look around and see if he could find a place.

Discussion covered the matter of taking bids, and what type of specifications should be drawn. The Mayor said he did not know today how the Council could instruct the City Attorney to even be looking for something in the way of bidding. The City Attorney suggested perhaps a contract similar to the one just discussed with the figures left blank could be submitted for bids, but pointed out there would be no guarantee about the esthetic qualities or of the development that would occur.

After much discussion, roll call on Councilman Long's motion that this new proposal be sent to the Parks and Recreation Board and the A.I.A. for their study and review, and that they be asked to bring it back to the Council as soon as they possibly can, showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Councilman Shanks made the following statement:

"I would like to say I am not for voting for this. I am going to vote for it rather than to vote against something I think would be for the good of Austin. I am for the project if and when the Council can negotiate the proper kind of contracts; but I'll vote for it just to get it along. 'Aye'."

MAYOR PALMER stated this would be referred to the Parks and Recreation Board and A.I.A., and the Council would hope they would come back with an answer. He asked that copies of the new proposal be sent out to those groups and that they be informed right away of the Council's action this afternoon so that they can get started right away.

Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Austin has found and does hereby find that the public necessity requires the acquisition and maintenance of a large recreational reserve to permit the creation of parks, playfields, camp grounds, golf courses, piers, wharves, together with the construction of a large water reservoir, and also to permit an addition to the electric light and generating system of the City of Austin, and the construction of certain roads and public ways; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council has found and determined that the public necessity requires the acquisition of the fee simple to the hereinafter described tract of land for such purposes; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Austin has negotiated with the owner of such land and has been unable to agree with such owner as to the fair cash market value thereof; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the City Manager be and he is hereby authorized and directed to file or cause to be filed against the owner, and lienholders, a suit in eminent

domain to acquire fee simple title for said purposes to the following described tract of land, to-wit:

SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED

EXHIBIT "A"

283.21 acres of land out of the Philip McElroy Survey in Travis County, Texas, being all that certain tract of land conveyed to Dan G. Huebner and wife by deeds recorded in Vol. 629, Page 58, and in Vol. 728, Page 636, of the Travis County Deed Records, and more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

BEGINNING at an iron pipe found in the east line of Decker Lane at the intersection of the south line of an 0.83 acre tract conveyed to Dan G. Huebner and described as Second Tract in deed recorded in Vol. 629, Pages 58-60, of the Travis County Deed Records, being also the northwest corner of that certain 46.23 acre tract conveyed to E. T. Holly by Wm. Yelderman by deed recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for the southwest corner of the tract herein described;

THENCE, with the fence along the east line of Decker Lane, N 30° 03' E crossing the line between the said Dan G. Huebner 172.83 acre tract conveyed to said Huebner as First Tract in deed recorded in Vol. 629, Pages 58-60, of the Travis County Deed Records, and the 114.25 acre tract conveyed to said Huebner by deed recorded in Vol. 728, Page 636, of the Travis County Deed Records, a distance of 2813.5 feet to an iron pipe set at fence corner in the south line of a county road, for the northwest corner of this tract, said county road running along the south line of the H. & T. C. RR;

THENCE, with the fence along the south line of the said county road, being the north line of the said Huebner 114.25 acre tract, S 86° 53' E a distance of 1607.53 feet to an angle point in fence for an angle point in this tract;

THENCE, continuing with the fence along the said county road, S 83° 53' E a distance of 182.9 feet to an iron pipe set at fence corner post for a corner of this tract;

THENCE, continuing with the fence along the south line of the said county road as follows: S 66° 00' E 640.27 feet; S 49° 33' E 384.66 feet; S 60° 36' E 967.23 feet to an iron pipe set at fence corner post at the northeast corner of the said Huebner 114.25 acre tract for the northeast corner of this tract;

THENCE, with the fence along the east line of the said Huebner 114.25 acre tract and the said Huebner 172.83 acre tract, S 29° 30' W a distance of 3570.15 feet to an iron pipe found at fence corner for the southeast corner of this tract;

THENCE, with an old down fence, N 60° 47' W a distance of 1384.5 feet to an iron pipe found at fence corner post, being the northeast corner of the said Huebner 0.83 acre tract for a corner of this tract;

THENCE, with a fence along the east line of the said 0.83 acre tract, S 29° 25' W a distance of 16.4 feet to an iron pipe found at fence corner at

June 16, 1966

the southeast corner of the said 0.83 acre tract in the north line of the said E. T. Holly tract for a corner of this tract;

THENCE, with the fence along the north line of the said E. T. Holly 46.23 acre tract and the south line of the said Huebner 0.83 acre tract, N 60° 25' W a distance of 2231.95 feet to the place of beginning, containing 283.21 acres of land; SAVE and EXCEPT, an easement to Travis County, Texas recorded in Volume 1599, Page 77 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas. (Ida B. Barlow, et al)

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

There being no further business Councilman Shanks moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Council adjourned at 6:20 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED

Lea E. Palmer
Mayor

ATTEST:

Elin Moody
City Clerk